



ADVERTISING
EVENING POST EXTRA.

HOMŒOPATHY VINDICATED,

IN A LETTER TO

J. V. C. SMITH, M. D.,

EDITOR OF THE

BOSTON MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL,

CONTAINING A REPLY TO HIS REVIEW OF DRS. C.
AND L'S. "EPITOME OF HOMŒOPATHIC PRACTICE," WITH THE ACCEPTANCE OF DR.

J. V. C. SMITH'S AND DR. C. A. LEE'S
CHALLENGES, AND THE
CONSEQUENCES,

BY

JAMES LILLIE, M. D.,

BROOKLYN, L. I.

"If persuaded by them you had given me veratrum, as to a madman, my intelligence had become insanity, and your art been blamed as the cause of my loss of reason. For veratrum given to the sane pours darkness on the mind ; but it is usually highly beneficial to the insane."

Democritus to Hippocrates.

NEW YORK.



ADVERTISEMENT

In the Journal of last Wednesday, 4th October, Dr. Smith accuses the writer of the following reply of great want of courtesy. He gave his pen to some man in a mask to call Homœopaths fools, knaves, forgers, humbugs and gentry without a mite of common sense, and more than to insinuate that the compilers of the "Epitome" were not honest. I reply without once retaliating a single hard word; yet the Dr. is shocked at my horrid discourtesy. I appeal to the public whether this is *candid*. He brought in his hand a most contemptuous challenge to try charcoal on the healthy subject. I, calmly or rather gladly, accept the challenge so far as possible, both of the man in the mask, and of him who is visible; and the Dr. does what he can to suppress my acceptance, and tells the world that I am very ill-bred. I appeal to the world whether this is *courageous*. He sanctioned the man in the mask, writing virtually, that we might swallow a pound avoirdupois, and I know not how much more of sulphur, charcoal, lime stone, sponge or flint, without any effect whatever; and when I brought Hippocrates from the grave to lecture to them in Greek on the importance of remembering the effects of drugs, and took the precaution to translate the lecture literally into their mother tongue, he mocks at my ignorance. I appeal even to the profession whether this is *grateful*.

I think I thus proved very plainly, as I said before, that the Dr's. evil "communications" had not corrupted my good manners. And behold the happy effect of my forbearance! The Dr. all at once becomes an advocate for courtesy, good breeding and science in controversy. May I venture to hint that my good "communication" seems to have improved even the Dr's. manners? for he actually admits now that there are scientific Homœopaths, aye, and honest ones too; confesses he knows nothing about Homœopathy, and begs for "light."

But though the Dr. is improved, he is not yet perfect. He must give over "countenancing nostrums," otherwise the Massachusetts Medical Society must in fairness call him to account, ("Medical Conservator," though he styles himself,) otherwise Dr. Starkweather may justly complain. A p. 484 of the Journal of July 19, he denounces the hapless brethren who "countenance nostrums," and yet in the next page but one he cries up the *Shakers' Compound Syrup of Sarsaparilla*. On looking to Dr. J. V. C. Smith's advertisement of

the compound syrup, we are assured that "it is prepared from the *best* and most *virtuous* alteratives of the vegetable kingdom." Still, however *good* and *virtuous* they are, like my critic, they are *masked*, secret, undivulged; they compose a nostrum. Dr. J. V. C. Smith in advertising them, "countenances nostrums; and however *good* and *virtuous* may be the vegetables, I appeal to the Massachusetts Medical Society whether Dr. J. V. C. Smith's conduct is either good or virtuous in twitting Dr. Starkweather with the mote that *was* in his eye, while such a beam is even now in his own.

As I was desirous of obtaining Dr. Lee's reply to my proposal, before throwing off the last impressions of the following letter, I requested a friend to wait on him and ascertain his views. The doctor sent the following note: "Dr. Lee's compliments to Dr. Lillie, and begs to assure him that he is gratified with the proposal of Dr. L., that he will take it into serious consideration, and inform Dr. L. of his acceptance, or the contrary, within a few days." I am sorry I cannot wait on the doctor, for the following reasons:

1st. I never knew precisely how many days made up a *few*; and late times have made me more uncertain than ever. I only know the mysterious term has been much lengthened.

2d. I think three full days were enough for the doctor to make up his mind whether he would eat a grain of charcoal.

3d. I could not think it kind to keep the doctor shivering on the fence between "acceptance" and the "contrary," when I thought he *might possibly* at last topple over on the "contrary" side. *Because*,

4th. A verbal message accompanied the note, that Dr. Lee was very busy with a publication, and *besides* was in very bad health, and therefore could not submit to the investigation. *Still* I must add,

5th. That the doctor must be feeble indeed if he fears a grain of charcoal. *And*,

6th, and last. The doctor promises to answer the Letter. This is so far well; but it would, on the whole, have been better had he *bravely* submitted to the *pinch of charcoal*, which nevertheless I am happy to find the doctor thinks worthy of a few days serious consideration. I am hoping the doctor will turn out a Hahnemannian after all.

To the Editor of the Evening Post :

Sir—The following reply to the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, was written, as I understood it, under promise of insertion. It is, however, declined. I respectfully solicit the favor of publication at your hands.

I remain Sir,

Your obedient servant,

JAMES LILLIE.

October 21, 1843,
65 Henry street, Brooklyn. }

BROOKLYN, L. I., 20th Sept, 1843, }
65 Henry street. }

J. V. C. SMITH, M. D.

Sir—After reading the critique which you thought proper to publish on the work of Dr. Curtis and myself, it was my intention to abstain from every thing in the shape of a reply. But as some whose judgment I feel bound to respect, imagine that the cause of science and humanity, may be benefitted by an answer to that production, I have thought it worth while to deviate from my first design.

The personalities and impertinences with which the review opens, and by which it is accompanied to its close, I shall treat with the silence they deserve.

You set out with the startling assertion, that Jahr's New Manual is a pure work of fiction ; " and in proof refer to the articles *Actea*, p. 23, *Aquilegia*, p. 61, *Chenopodium*, p. 140, and *Nigella*, p. 253." I know not what your readers will think, when they learn that not one of these drugs is to be found in the New Manual. My proof is, that page 23 is occupied by *Ambra*, 61 by *Assafetida*, 140 by *Cantharis*, and 253 by *Grannatum* and *Graphites*. So foul a stumble at the very start is surely ominous of a disastrous journey.

You allege that the acknowledged forgeries of Drs. Fickel Heyne and Hoffbauer, should discredit the whole Homœopathic materia medica ; " If twenty pages of symptoms have been forged, how do you know but all is of the same character ?—Drs Fickel Heyne, Hoffbauer, stand high in the list of Homœopathic authors, but if they don't hesitate to 'forge' what dependence can be placed upon the other ?" I say we know infallibly, that all the other pages are not of the same character with the forged twenty, because those others have formed the basis of successful Homœopathic practice throughout the world. True you will tell me that practice is an absurdity ; and I tell you Dr.

you speak evil of what you know not. Sir ! Do I accuse you of ignorance without the best of reasons ? Where did you learn that Drs. Fickel, Heyne, &c., stood high on the list of Homœopathic authors ? Till you took it upon you to lecture Dr. Capen and the authors of the silly manual on the subject of Homœopathy, I had imagined that Fickel and Heyne were *aliases* of one forger, and that that forger was an *Allopath* ! Besides what fairness or force is there in your logic ? Drs. Fickel and Heyne, Homœopaths, forged, therefore all Homœopaths from Hahnemann downwards, are forgers ? As it turns out that Janus Fickel Heyne was an Allopath, may I not return with deadly force, the poisoned dart which you have thrown away at me ? Janus Fickel Heyne an Allopath, forged ; therefore all Allopaths are forgers ; consequently J. V. C. Smith, M. D., editor, &c., is a —. No ! Sir, I do not say so ; but if I do not, it is because your evil "communications" have not corrupted my good manners.

You write " This precious confession (i. e. of the forgeries) furnishes a clue to one of the mysteries connected with this occult art. Many persons have wondered how it was, that so many thousands of the most violent symptoms, could be produced by some of the most inert substances, many of which are not known to produce any effects whatever, in any appreciable dose ; why, for example, simple carbonate of lime could produce six pages of symptoms ; charcoal as many more ; sponge, silex and sulphur each as many more, &c ; the secret, however, is now revealed—these German transcendentalists have been amusing themselves by drawing up imaginary systems of materia medica, and fools or knaves enough have been found, who were willing to take their systems upon trust, without so much as putting a single article to the test of actual trial, on a person in a state of health ; although a mite of common sense, would have shown these gentry that there was not and could not be a single well established fact in the whole farrago of stuff, so pompously published forth as systems of Homœopathic Materia Medica."

This passage certainly contains some very striking assertions, which might, in my judgment, have been left to produce their proper effect, without the garnishing about "fools and knaves" and "gentry" without "a mite of common sense," and such like ornaments of speech. My business, how-

ever, Dr. is with your assertions, not with your taste. You surely write in great haste, and without sufficient reflection, when you allege that carbonate of lime, charcoal, sponge, silex, sulphur, &c., are not known to produce any effects whatever in any appreciable dose ! This on a moment's thought, you must know, is not merely not true, it is a glaring, outrageous, audacious denial, of what every man whether dolt or doctor, knows to be fact in regard to one or other of these substances. I presume you merely meant to say that these drugs were inactive in comparison of others. But if so, you are for a critic, rather unfortunate in your selection of terms. Even with this modification I join issue with you. I deny then that sulphur and charcoal and silex, are inert substances. Inert ! Why sir, without these same despised articles, the American rifle would never have been heard on this continent, nor Bunker's Hill known, except as the spacious sepulchre, in which Warren and American freedom lay entombed. You will no doubt retort that my reference proves nothing, that you were speaking of sulphur and charcoal in their crude common form, and not when subjected to special preparation, and placed in peculiar circumstances. Very well. And are you ignorant that Hahnemann subjected his sulphur and charcoal to special preparation, and placed them in peculiar circumstances ? The ingredients of gunpowder, were never triturated with more care by the discoverer of that astounding secret than the single substances were triturated by the discoverer (now immortal) of a secret still more astounding and infinitely more beneficent. Here you will break in with your assertion, that all this about trituration and dilution, is sheer impostures I perceive like Dr. Reese you prefer the term humbug. But, sir, how do you know it is imposture ? If you do not know it, then perhaps you are giving the lie to men of whom it is no exaggerated praise to say, they are as good as yourself. I, yes sir, I know it is no imposture. I have hundreds of times made these triturations and dilutions with my own hands ; far oftener have I applied them in the treatment of disease, and I know it is no imposture, but the greatest scientific discovery with which any age has been blessed. Did you ever make a Homœopathic trituration ? Did you ever take a grain of charcoal, work on it for three hours to get a millionth of it, and apply that millionth to a carefully discriminated case of disease, to which

Hahnemann says it is applicable ? Never !—Then what do you know about it ? I do not ask what do you believe, suppose, fancy ? That I know well enough. But what can you know ?—The plain truth is you know just as much as Dr. W. Holmes on this point. Not an atom more. Yet you go on.

“ The practitioners of this school have again and again been challenged to produce upon the healthy any one of the one thousand symptoms laid down in this book ; but have they accepted the challenge ? Not they—and nothing would they deprecate so much as such a test. Take for example ‘carbo vegetabilis.’” Ah ! I like this. It is coming to the point of the bayonet. Now for the charge !

Dr. Lee of New York, once proposed to me, to have a committee appointed for the purpose of pursuing such an investigation. I promptly agreed and actually spoke to Dr. Mott about presiding.—The thing fell through. Possibly Dr. Lee thinks I shunned the test. But he is mistaken, as I shall now convince him. I now propose to Dr. Lee that he shall select two physicians, and I two, and that we six shall agree on a chairman ; that charcoal shall be the substance tested ; that Dr. Lee shall be one subject ; that he shall not be asked to take more than one grain of the charcoal ; that to prevent the possibility of unfairness on either side the charcoal shall be prepared and swallowed in committee ; that the experiments shall be varied as the committee may agree ; and that the results be published.

And, Dr. if you would allow me, I would further propose that a similar committee should be got up in Boston ; that Dr. Smith should do, I should possibly say, *suffer* there, what I hope Dr. Lee will not to in decline submitting New York ; and that the result be handed down to future ages, in the pages of the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal.

You tell us that “Dr. Joerg of Leipsic has made experiments with drugs on healthy subjects ; that his results bear no resemblance to Hahnemann's, and that no candid person can compare the two, without a full conviction, that the whole Homœopathic materia medica, like the portions already acknowledged to be so, have been ‘forged’ after the manner of Heyne, Hoffbauer & Co.

Sir, when I took Dr. J. V. C. Smith in hand, it was my determination to mingle justice as far as

possible with gentleness. I intended, as Brutus says of Cæsar:

"To carve him as dish fit for the gods,
Not hew him as a carcase fit for hounds."

But you tempt me somewhat too much. Sir, I have examined Joerg's results, in the 10th volume of the American Journal of Medicine, and I find them substantially the same with Hahnemann's. And, therefore, if Hahnemann is a forger, as he preceded Joerg by so many years, Joerg must be the forger of a forger. I must not imitate you in giving bare assertions. To the proof then. I pass nitre, because Hahnemann does not give the pathogenesis, and because Joerg's results have actually been incorporated in the homœopathic works. Let us take *arnica montana*. Joerg says: "It produces a very decided irritation of the whole tract of the alimentary canal; and especially of the œsophagus (gullet,) stomach and small intestines." Hahnemann says it produces "burning in the bottom of the throat;" "nausea, vomiting and violent retching," "dysenteric bellyache," "digging in the depth of the lower belly," "little frequent stools, consisting only of mucus." Perhaps you are not aware that these are proofs of "very decided irritation of the whole tract of the alimentary canal." Joerg says it caused "a modification in the quantity and quality of the urinary discharge."—Hahnemann, eschewing such generalities, specifies "frequent desire to pass water," "watery urine," "retention of urine," "tenseness at the neck of the bladder," vain efforts to pass water," &c. &c. Joerg says the irritation extends to the brain. Hahnemann says it produces dizziness, stupefaction; internal heat of the head, headache, and so on for four or five pages, Svo. Joerg says it quickens circulation and increases cutaneous exhalation; Hahnemann, that it produces fever and sweat. Joerg says it excites "a kind of itching in the pharynx and larynx," that leads to "cough." Hahnemann specifies "every morning after rising, dry hacking cough, as from a tickling deep in the wind pipe." This is all that Joerg affirms of *arnica*. It is plain then that Hahnemann anticipated him on every one point years before. True, indeed, the founder of homœopathy tells us infinitely more about *arnica* than the Leipsic Professor. But so far as the latter says any thing, he merely repeats his peerless predecessor. I might go through all the other remedies, and show the results to be substantially the same. And to crown all, the very review to which

you refer as authority, expressly acknowledges that "Hahnemann's observations were founded on numerous and diversified experiments." And yet you, Dr. Smith, (or some skulking scribbler for whom you make yourself responsible,) tell the world that "Joerg's results bear no resemblance to Hahnemann's, and that no candid (yes, *candid* is the word) person can compare the two, without a full conviction, that the whole homœopathic materia medica, like the portions already acknowledged to be so, have been "forged" after the manner of Heyne, Hoffbauer & Co." What shall I say to you? Are you not ashamed? Do you not blush even in the solitude of your office?

One or two inferences have suggested themselves to my mind while reading the Review of Joerg, which I am induced simply to indicate, from their deep importance to the profession and the public. The first is the confirmation which the reviewer unintentionally gives to one of the most formidable of Hahnemann's charges against the old system, that allopathy administers drugs not on any known, settled or consistent principle, but empirically, that is in plain English, *quackishly*. What says the Reviewer, p. 131? "In regard to the latter, (the using of remedies) we have little better for our guide than mere empiricism." And in p. 132, we find "in relation to a still larger class of remedies, our ignorance is still more profound." Dr. Hodge, of Philadelphia, at p. 92, regards "the science of medicine as still in an embryotic condition." Louis, of Paris, maintains that medicine is still in its infancy; but Hodge regards it as an embryo. No wonder Napoleon believed it nothing at all. Perhaps the Reviewer was emboldened to make his remarkable admissions from believing that Joerg had at last washed off the damning stain of an empirical materia medica. But he was too precipitate. Joerg is absolutely paralysed by his own discoveries. Finding to his astonishment that nitre produces inflammation of the stomach and intestines, he is horrified at the way in which his brethren lavish the drug in acute inflammation, insists that it can no more be ranked as an antiphlogistic than arsenic; and that the profession have been deceived as to its real properties. Valerian excites the brain and bowels, and is prohibited in all cases where there is any excitement in those parts, and is allowed merely as a tonic. *Serpentaria*, too, excites the intestinal canal, and brain, and can only be used when the action in these organs is low; in

short, it is a tonic. Just so of arnica; it irritates the bowels and brain, but [may] be used as a tonic. So of camphor, musk, Ignatius' bean, asafetida, digitalis and iodine; they all stimulate the bowels and brain, and cannot be used where inflammation is present, or threatened; they are all tonics. Indeed Joerg's remedies seem all as like each other as kidney beans; and I should like to hear any one explain why one should be preferred to another in any given disease. If inflammation, or even excitement is present in either bowels or brain, not one of them must be touched; if there is debility in either, any, for aught that is shown, may serve. In fact, the only value of Joerg's observations, arises from the strong confirmation they lend to Hahnemann's. As guides in the sick chamber, they are absolutely valueless; a fact you cannot deny without condemning your own practice, which I take for granted is the ordinary routine, and that you are aware Joerg explodes. You must pardon me when I express my surprise, that you should refer so complacently to Joerg as upsetting Hahnemann, when the simple fact turns out to be, that he only upsets yourself.

I must say I am not a little curious to see the other results of the Leipzig professor, as I cannot imagine how they can substantially differ, from those he has already obtained. For example, arsenic will undoubtedly be found irritating the whole intestinal canal; and the irritation will as surely be found extending to the brain. It will therefore turn out to be a tonic merely. So of aconite, belladonna, nuxvomica, chamomile, bark, mercury, veratrum, ipecacuanha; every one of them, I am sure, in Joerg's doses, and *yours*, will irritate both bowels and brain, and according to the simple logic of Joerg, (may I add of yourself?) must be absolutely abstained from, when we find any irritation in either of those wide domains. If indeed there be torpor, debility, inaction in brain or bowels, they will all prove valuable *tonics*. Such a barren uniformity of result, and such a dead level of unmeaning indication, could only spring from some mistake in the mode of making the experiments, and some gross delusion in judging of their meaning when made. That mistake I maintain to have been the large crude doses in which the drugs were administered, and that delusion the notion that no drug could do any thing but mischief, in diseases which it seemed to create.

Unhappily for the professor and his pupils, and

still more for their patients, and for *yours*, inflammation is the enemy we have to encounter every day; if he cannot teach us how to meet him, the battle will probably be lost before his tonics can enter the field. Truly, by increasing the knowledge of his brethren he has increased their sorrow. He has shewn them that while they have been intent on subduing inflammation, they have really only been adding to his strength; and that though they have plenty of charms for raising the fiend, they have not one that can lay him. To Hahnemann alone belongs the glory of revealing the secret. His works demonstrate that every drug cures that disease which most resembles the one which it creates; that if it is mighty in exciting some specific inflammation, it must for that very reason be mighty in subduing one precisely analogous; that the value of any substance is just in proportion to its power of doing harm; and that to turn the destroying tyrant into a prompt and beneficent servant, we have only to adopt the method which he propounds. The dose must be changed as well as the principle on which it is selected. If we meet with a disease (a case of cholera, for example,) which strongly resembles the effects of arsenic on the human system, then just as surely as one grain of arsenic would kill the patient, so surely will the homœopathic fraction of a grain commence and probably complete the cure. For God has not made the living human organism, to entertain two analogous irritations, natural and artificial, at the same time, and if we can only make an impression with the artificial, the natural must die.

You say, "in running our eye over the work, there appears to be but very slight correspondence between the curative and pathogenetic symptoms, which ought, according to the homœopathic doctrine to correspond."

They *do* correspond. There is not one pathogenetic symptom in the book which is not also a curative one. "In running your eyes over the work" you have made them run too fast, not to see the word CURATIVE following PATHOGENETIC, at the beginning of every drug; and therefore your quotation of Sarsaparilla which suppresses the word CURATIVE after PATHOGENETIC is a mistake; were I to treat you as you deserve, I should say—forgery. Why there should be any curative symptoms which are not also pathogenetic, can be easily understood by any man who reflects on the

necessary imperfections, of even the best experiments on the healthy; and the great difficulty I may say impossibility, of always attaining absolute certainty in our treatment of the sick.

When you complain of what you fancy the arbitrary omission of so many symptoms in the "epitome," it is plain you do not comprehend the plan of the work you profess to criticise. It is purely a synopsis of our recorded cures. Doubtless symptoms have been cured which are not in the work; but as these are not recorded, it is no omission for which we are responsible. Indeed, the best description of the book is contained in these words of Hippocrates: "Εστο δε σοι παντα εὐμνημονεῦτα, φάρμακα, καὶ τε δυνάμεις ἁπλαι, καὶ ἀναγράμματα, εἴπερ ἀρα ἐστὶν ἐν νοῷ, καὶ τὰ περὶ νοσούντων, καὶ ὅτι τοιούτων τρόποι, ἡσυχῆς, καὶ ἡνέτροπον περὶ ἡκαστὸν εἰσὶν. Ἠαυτὲ γὰρ ἀρῆ ἐν ἱετρικῇ, καὶ μέσα, καὶ τέλος." "Let all drugs and simple and recorded powers, be well remembered by you, provided they are known; and the cures of diseases and their modes, how often and in what manner they affect each. For this is the beginning and middle, and end of medicine." Hipp. On what is suitable for a physician. I am not aware that Hahnemann himself has given so brief and yet adequate a description of his science as this is. "Simple powers" is the very phrase that he selects for his drugs; and it is a literal Hippocratism.

You are more than ordinarily facetious about Sepia. You say "we had no idea it was such a concentration of lightning." I believe you had no idea about it at all. You are now to be informed that Hippocrates (as I have verified; the other references I take as I find them) valued that fish as furnishing a specific in some female complaints; a peculiarity in its mighty range which every homœopath has realized. He also regarded it as an astringent. Pliny calls it a purgative and diuretic, and recommends it against catarrh of the bladder. Nor is he on the first point inconsistent with Hippocrates: for it is the fact, it produces and cures both constipation and diarrhœa, as the "starveling compilation" expresses or implies. You did not know then what you were doing when you put an ! after constipation as caused by magnesia. Joerg tells you ignatia produces either constipation or purging; and if ignatia, why not magnesia? Besides this fish was used by Galen as a stomachic, and as a remedy for itch; by Soranus for baldness; by

Marcellus against gravel and freckles; and by Paulus of Aegina and Aetius for cutaneous affections. Thus we find the observers of all antiquity uniting in certifying the fulness and accuracy of that materia medica, which you denounce as pure fiction and forgery. You perceive it is in mercy to your moral character that I stigmatise you as ignorant.

You tell us, "we should not suppose, *a priori*, that silex would be very formidable." Sir, *a priori* suppositions have been the bane of medicine and science since the beginning. You think you know all about silex; and, after all, the amount of your knowledge is, that the common acids do not act on it; and therefore it must be classed with *inerts*. But then how is it with fluoric acid, or an alkali; bring either of these in contact with silex, and he bestirs himself at once. However satisfied you may be with your knowledge of inert silex, Drs. Liebig and Christison are yearly learning more about it. Go to the beautiful Tract of Hippocrates, from which I have already quoted, entitled "On what is becoming," (he means in a physician,) and you may learn many many things besides this: "For to suppose, and do nothing, is a mark of ignorance and want of skill; since *supposition* is the worst crime in a physician; and it is ruin to the patient."

You ask, "how do they (the homœopaths) treat a fracture?" Hahnemann never gave his system to the world as a system of surgery, though he does say, in passing, that in such a case the ends of the bone must be brought together. You say he is inconsistent in this. Well! Dr. J. V. C. Smith, Editor, &c., differs with Samuel Hahnemann. But then you must know, that though he took away the M. D. from his name, (and well he might be ashamed of it when he saw the creatures that carried it,) still it is true he was a regular Dr.; and, therefore, why may not Dr. Hahnemann differ with Dr. Smith? But though homœopathy no more than honor "can set to a leg," as Falstaff says; still it is not in every sense true of homœopathy, as the same authority says of honor, that "it hath no skill in surgery;" for very many diseases which are called surgical are best treated homœopathically, provided they are taken in time. I have just undertaken two cases of fistula in the incipient stage, which it would afford me much pleasure to submit to the experienced eyes of our two professors of surgery, together with the plan of treatment. That plan will embrace sulphur, car-

bonate of lime and silex as leading remedies. And I have good reason for believing that it would rejoice them both, equally as men and surgeons, to find that the cure may be effected without the knife. They have seen too much of the world, and I will add of homœopathy, to treat such a proposal as most of their less favored brethren would do.

And now for "cutis ovium vulgo sheep skin." Bating your clumsy embellishment about a flock, &c., it is true I advised sheep skin with its natural heat to be wrapped about a paraplegiac, whose vital energy had been almost exhausted by a severe disease and severer treatment. From the difficulty of procuring such a skin the remedy was not applied. I do not think it courteous to respectable survivors, for you to stigmatise their departed relative as a sheep for consenting to such a prescription. Were that respectable gentleman living, you would not dare to use any such insolence. But we all know it is safe to kick a dead lion. However, this I will say, when he came into my hands, he bore the marks of the wolves.

Nor was the treatment so ridiculous as you and your more ignorant readers imagine. Among other remedies in palsy, Hufeland recommends vital heat as having an efficacy altogether special, "so that it is useful to apply living things to the part," and "to plunge it in the foaming entrails of an animal just killed." And Constant, in his memoirs, tells us that M. Charvet wrapped the first wife of Bonaparte in a skin taken from a sheep just killed, when she fell from a balcony at Plombières.

Still you will cavil—this was not homœopathic. Sir, when I came under the responsibilities of my diploma, I did not promise to limit myself to homœopathy, allopathy, or any other system. I was pledged, as I understood it, to do every thing in my power for the benefit of my patient. But are you sure it was not homœopathic? You have been so often set right in this discussion that I think you must have some misgivings whether your name is Smith, should I call it in question.—Be not alarmed, Mr. Editor, my discussion with you is closed. The topic I hinted at is too subtle

to be comprehended by every man who writes himself M. D., or trifles with types; and therefore you and I had perhaps better let it alone.

I will close with part of Hahnemann's advice to his critics: "I will now point out to my adversaries, an infallible way of subverting, if it be possible, this doctrine, which threatens to stifle their conjectural art. Homœopathy rests solely on experience. Imitate me, she says with a loud voice, but imitate me exactly, and you will see at every step the proof of what I advance. What no materia medica, system of medicine, or of Therapeutics, has hitherto done, or been able to do, she loudly demands; she will be judged by her deeds.

"There she is then, just where you would have her. You may give her the death blow.

"Take cases of disease, one after another, describe them in the way marked out in the Organon, paint them so well, after all their perceptible symptoms, that the author of Homœopathy himself shall have nothing to say against the exactness of the picture, and supposing the cases to be such, that a remedy may be found among those hitherto tested, chose the drug which is most homœopathically appropriate, give it alone, in doses as weak as the doctrine prescribes, withdrawing all other medicinal influence, and if the disease is not cured, if it is not cured mildly, if it is not cured permanently, cover Homœopathy publicly with shame, by proclaiming the want of success in a treatment followed rigorously according to her principles.

"But abstain, I beseech you, from all falsehood. Imposture, sooner or later, is unmasked, and brands with ineffaceable disgrace.

"If after acting conscientiously thus, others not less conscientious arrive at the same results while repeating your trials; if all that Homœopathy promises to him who follows her faithfully, does not happen, then this doctrine may be considered lost. It is lost, if it do not show itself efficacious, if it do not display a remarkable efficacy."

What can the man do that cometh after the King?

Yours, &c.

JAMES LILLIE, M. D.